







reason why to combine Schuster, and if so, why to take just the claimed feature from this cited reference.

With respect to those claims dependent from claim 22, Applicants respond as follows. The rejection of claim 24 is traversed for the same reasons recited above with respect to claims 1 and 21, namely, that the claimed feature is not disclosed or suggested by Omura. With respect to claim 25, the other lens group is defined in base claim 22. Clearly, the lenses L 6 - L8 and L 10 do not fit into this definition, as there is no antecedent first negative lens group more object wise. With respect to claim 27, the second sentence is copied from the argument concerning claim 26 and therefore does not particularly relate to claim 27 on the basis that Applicants do not see where the Examiner sees 9 aspheric surfaces. Further clarification is requested.

With respect to independent claim 29, this claim has been amended to clarify that the term secondary waist refers to a  $\frac{1}{2}$  waist and therefore the two terms are interchangeable. Applicants have added the expression "1/2" to claim 29 to clarify this matter. Page 5, line 7, of the specification supports this change.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 29 for at least the same reason recited above as to claim 1 is allowable, namely that neither Omura nor Schuster nor a combination thereof recites a projection lens having a  $\frac{1}{2}$  waist. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 29 are respectfully requested.

Further, with respect to claim 29, it is to be noted that Schuster ( paragraph [0024]) in no way is related to aspeheres or diameters of light. Also, those skilled in the art would not fully comprehend the Examiner's argument since aspheres and allowed diameter of light are in no directly linked. Aspheres are a designer's tool for optimizing error correction of optics.

Based on the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claim 29 are earnestly solicited.

The rejection of claim 30 is respectfully traversed for the same reasons as those recited above in connection with the discussion of claim 1. As a result, reconsideration and allowance of claim 30 are respectfully requested.

Newly added claim 31 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 30.

Claim 17 has been rewritten into independent form by including the subject matter of claim 1 and therefore, based on the Examiner's indication that claim 17 contains allowable subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 has been rewritten into independent form by including the subject matter of claim 1 and therefore, based on the Examiner's indication that claim 18 contains allowable subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 has been rewritten into independent form by including the subject matter of claim 1 and therefore, based on the Examiner's indication that claim 19 contains allowable subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: November 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant